arXiv:1412.1214v2 [math.OC] 9 Mar 2015

ON THE BANG-BANG TYPE NASH EQUILIBRIUM POINT FOR MARKOVIAN NONZERO-SUM STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL GAME

SAID HAMADÈNE * AND RUI MU †

Abstract. In this paper, we study a nonzero-sum stochastic differential game of bang-bang type in the Markovian framework. We show the existence of a Nash equilibrium point for this game. The main tool is the notion of backward stochastic differential equations which, in our case, are multidimensional with discontinuous generators with respect to z component.

Key words. Nonzero-sum Stochastic Differential Games; Nash Equilibrium Point; Backward Stochastic Differential Equations ; Bang-bang type control.

AMS subject classifications. 49N70; 49N90; 91A15.

1. Introduction. This paper is related to nonzero-sum stochastic differential games (NZSDG, for short) of bang-bang type in the Markovian framework which we describe below.

We consider the case of two players π_1 and π_2. If there are more than two players, the adaptation is straightforward. The two players π_1 and π_2 act on a system through two admissible controls $u := (u_s)_{s\leq T}$ and $v := (v_s)_{s\leq T}$ which are adapted stochastic processes, with values in compact metric spaces U and V, respectively. The dynamics of the controlled system is given by a stochastic process $(X_s^{u,v})_{s\leq T}$, solution of the following standard stochastic differential equation (SDE, for short):

$$dX_s^{u,v} = \Gamma(s, X_s^{u,v}, u_s, v_s)ds + \sigma(s, X_s^{u,v})dB_s \text{ for } s \leq T, \text{ and } X_0 = x_0 \tag{1.1}$$

where $B := (B_s)_{s\leq T}$ is a Brownian motion. Next with each player π_i, $i = 1, 2$, is associated a payoff $J_i(u, v)$, $i = 1, 2$, given by:

$$J_i(u, v) = \mathbf{E}[g_i(X_T^{u,v})]. \tag{1.2}$$

The objective is to find a pair (u^*, v^*) which satisfy

$$J_1(u^*, v^*) \geq J_1(u, v^*) \text{ and } J_2(u^*, v^*) \geq J_2(u^*, v) \text{ for any pair } (u, v). \tag{1.3}$$

As we can see, the payoff function of the player π_1 (resp. π_2) depends not only on its own control u (resp. v) but also on the control used by the other player π_2 (resp. π_1). Therefore there is a game between the two players which is of cooperative relationship. This kind of game is known as the nonzero-sum stochastic differential game. The pair (u^*, v^*) of (1.3) is called a Nash equilibrium point (NEP, for short) of the game. Its meaning is that when it is implemented by both players, then if π_1 (resp. π_2) decides unilaterally to change a control while π_2 (resp. π_1) keeps v^* (resp. u^*) then her payoff $J_1(u, v^*)$ (resp. $J_2(u^*, v)$) is lesser than $J_1(u^*, v^*)$ (resp. $J_2(u^*, v^*)$), i.e., her action of unilateral deviation induces a penalty.

* Université du Maine, LMM, Avenue Olivier Messiaen, 72085 Le Mans, Cedex 9, France. (hamadene@univ-lemans.fr).

† Corresponding author. Center for Financial Engineering, Soochow University, Suzhou 215006, P. R. China; Université du Maine, LMM, Avenue Olivier Messiaen, 72085 Le Mans, Cedex 9, France. (rui.mu.sdu@gmail.com). This author's research was supported in part by the Natural Science Foundation for Young Scientists of Jiangsu Province, P. R. China (No. BK20140299).

In the case when $J_1(u,v)+J_2(u,v)=0$, the game turns into the well-known zero-sum differential game which is widely studied in the literature (see e.g. [7, 8, 9, 18, 19], etc. and the references therein). On the other hand, if $X^{u,v}$ does not depend on v then the problem turns merely into a control problem. In this specific case, we know that an optimal control exists and is of bang-bang type since it takes values only on the boundaries of U according to the derivative of the value function of the control problem. This is the consequence of the fact that the instantaneous reward in (1.2) is null. So one would expect the same features of the NEP of this game if it exists.

The nonzero-sum differential game is also considered by several authors in the literature, see eg. [4, 5, 10, 12, 31, 16, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 11], to name a few. There are typically two approaches. One method is related to partial differential equation (PDE) theory. Some of the results show that the payoff function of the game is the unique viscosity solution of a related Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equation, e.g., [26]. Other works make use of the Sobolev theory of PDEs (see [4, 5, 16, 27], etc.) to deal with NZSDGs. Comparatively, another popular way to deal with stochastic differential game is the backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE) approach [20, 21, 22, 26], which characterizes the payoffs of the game through solutions of associated BSDEs. However those BSDEs are of multidimensional type and usually their generators are non-Lipschitz. Therefore proving that they have solutions is not an easy task.

In the present article, we study the above NZSDG via the BSDE arguments in the Markovian framework. For clarity reasons we consider a special game model in assuming that:

(i) the process X of (1.1) is $\mathbf{R}$-valued, and $U=[0,1]$, $V=[-1,1]$;

(ii) the drift Γ of (1.1) has the following structure:

$$\Gamma(t,x,u,v)=f(t,x)+u+v.$$

The conditions on the functions f and g_i, $i=1,2$, are rather weak since they are related to measurability and growth conditions.

At the end of the paper we give hints which allow to generalize this setting in several directions, especially if the dynamics contains a diffusion term and the multidimensional case for the process $X^{u,v}$.

In this problem the main difficulty is lodged at the level of the main BSDE (2.11) associated with this NZSDG. Once the existence of its solution is stated, it provides the NEP of the game. As pointed out previously, this BSDE is of multidimensional type (here of dimension two since there are two players) and whose generator is discontinuous in z. The main challenge we overcome is to show that this BSDE has a solution and then we constructed a NEP for the game defined by (1.1), (1.2) and (i)-(ii) above. Like in the control framework, this NEP is of bang-bang type since the payoffs have no instantaneous payoffs included. This is the main novelty of this article. The closest work to ours is the one by P.Manucci [27], but this latter concerns only diffusions in bounded domains and the requirements on the regularity of the data are stronger than ours due to the method she employed based on PDEs in Sobolev spaces.

This paper is organized as follows:

In Subsection 2.1, we introduce the game problem and some preliminaries. The formulation we adopt is of weak type. Besides, for intuitive understanding, we work

with a particular setting of controls and state process $X^{u,v}$. The extension to the multidimensional situation obviously holds following the same ideas. The explicit form of discontinuous controls, namely, bang-bang controls are presented in Subsection 2.2. In Subsection 2.3, we give the main result (Theorem 2.6) of this work and some other related important results. We first provide a link between the game problem and Backward SDEs (Proposition 2.3). The payoff of the game can be characterized by the initial value of the solution for an associated BSDE. Then, by Proposition 2.4, we prove that the existence of a NEP for the game is equivalent to the existence of a solution of a BSDE which is of multidimensional and with discontinuous generator with respect to z. Finally, under some reasonable assumption, we provide the solution of this special BSDE (Theorem 2.5). All the proofs are stated in Subsection 2.4. The proofs of Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 are standard. For Theorem 2.5, the method is mainly based on an approximating scheme. In Section 3, we investigate some possible generalizations. The idea is the same with a bit modification which is indicated.

2. Bang-bang type NZSDG and multidimensional BSDEs with discontinuous generators. In this section, we first deal with the bang-bang type nonzero-sum stochastic differential game problem in 1-dimensional framework. A more general setting will be given in the next section.

2.1. Statement of the problem. Let $T > 0$ be fixed and let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ be a probability space, on which is defined a 1-dimensional standard Brownian motion $B := (B_t)_{t\leq T}$. For $t \leq T$, let us set $F_t := \sigma(B_u, u \leq t)$ and denote by $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\leq T}$ the completion of $(F_t)_{t\leq T}$ with the $\mathbf{P}$-null sets of $\mathcal{F}$. Next let $\mathcal{P}$ be the σ-algebra on $[0,T]\times\Omega$ of $\mathcal{F}_t$-progressively measurable sets. For a real constant $p \geq 1$, we introduce the following spaces:

- $L^p = \{\xi :\ \mathcal{F}_T$-measurable and $\mathbf{R}$-valued random variable s.t.$\mathbf{E}[|\xi|^p] < \infty\}$;
- $\mathcal{S}^p_T(\mathbf{R}) = \{Y = (Y_s)_{s\in[0,T]} :\ \mathcal{P}$-measurable, continuous and $\mathbf{R}$-valued stochastic process s.t. $\mathbf{E}[\sup_{s\in[0,T]} |Y_s|^p] < \infty\}$;
- $\mathcal{H}^p_T(\mathbf{R}) = \{Z = (Z_s)_{s\in[0,T]} :\ \mathcal{P}$-measurable and $\mathbf{R}$-valued stochastic process s.t. $\mathbf{E}[(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds)^{p/2}] < \infty\}$.

We consider, in this article, the 2-player case which we describe accurately below. The general multiple players case is a straightforward adaptation.

Let $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbf{R}$ and $X^{t,x}$ be the stochastic process defined as follows:

$$\forall s \leq T,\ X^{t,x}_s = x + (B_{s\vee t} - B_t). \tag{2.1}$$

REMARK 2.1. *Note that we consider a trivial situation for SDE* (2.1) *with an identity diffusion process, just for easy understanding. The trick of the technique in this article still valid for general diffusion process with appropriate properties. We will introduce this point in Section 3.*

Each player π_i, $i = 1, 2$, has her own control. Let us denote next by $U = [0,1]$, $V = [-1,1]$ those two compact subsets of $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathcal{M}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_2$) the set of $\mathcal{P}$-measurable process $u = (u_t)_{t\leq T}$ (resp. $v = (v_t)_{t\leq T}$) on $[0,T]\times\Omega$ with value in U (resp. V). Hereafter, we call $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_1$, resp. $\mathcal{M}_2$) the set of admissible controls for the two players (resp. first player ; resp. second player).

Let $f : (t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ be a Borelian function. We will say that f is of linear growth if there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ such that for any $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbf{R}$,

$$|f(t,x)| \leq C(1 + |x|). \tag{2.2}$$

Next let Γ be the function such that for any $(t,x,u,v) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R} \times U \times V$ associates $\Gamma(t,x,u,v) = f(t,x) + u + v \in \mathbf{R}$. The function Γ stands for the drift of the dynamics of the system when controlled by the two players π_i, $i = 1,2$. When f is of linear growth, the function Γ is so since U and V are bounded sets.

Next for $(u.,v.) \in \mathcal{M}$, let $\mathbf{P}_{t,x}^{u,v}$ be the positive measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ defined as follows:

$$d\mathbf{P}_{t,x}^{u,v} = \zeta_T(\Gamma(.,X.^{t,x},u.,v.))d\mathbf{P} \text{ with } \zeta_s(\Theta) := 1 + \int_0^s \Theta_r \zeta_r dB_r,\ s \in [t,T], \tag{2.3}$$

for any $\mathcal{P}$-measurable $\mathbf{R}$-valued process $\Theta := (\Theta_s)_{s \leq T}$. It follows from the uniform linear growth property of Γ that $\mathbf{P}_{t,x}^{u,v}$ is a probability on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ (see Appendix A of [14] or [25], pp.200). Then, by Girsanov's Theorem ([17]), the process $B^{u,v} = (B_s - \int_0^s \Gamma(r, X_r^{t,x}, u_r, v_r)dr)_{s \leq T}$ is a $(\mathcal{F}_s, \mathbf{P}_{t,x}^{u,v})$-Brownian motion and $(X_s^{t,x})_{s \leq T}$ satisfies the following SDE

$$dX_s^{t,x} = \Gamma(s, X_s^{t,x}, u_s, v_s)ds + dB_s^{u,v},\ \forall s \in [t,T] \text{ and } X_s^{t,x} = x,\ s \in [0,t]. \tag{2.4}$$

As a matter of fact, the process $X^{t,x}$ is not adapted with respect to the filtration generated by the Brownian motion $B^{u,v}$. Thereby, $X^{t,x}$ is a weak solution for the SDE (2.4). If the system starts from $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ at $t = 0$ and is controlled by player π_1 (resp. π_2) with $u.$ (resp. $v.$), the law of its dynamics is the same as the one of X^{0,x_0} under $\mathbf{P}_{0,x_0}^{u,v}$.

Once more let $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ fixed. We will precise the payoffs of the players when they implement the pair of strategies $(u.,v.)$. It is of terminal type and given, for player π_1 (resp. π_2), by

$$J_1(u,v) := \mathbf{E}_{0,x_0}^{u,v}[g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})] \text{ (resp. } J_2(u,v) := \mathbf{E}_{0,x_0}^{u,v}[g_2(X_T^{0,x_0})]), \tag{2.5}$$

where:
(i) g_1 and g_2 are two Borel measurable functions from $\mathbf{R}$ to $\mathbf{R}$ which are of polynomial growth, *i.e.*, there exist non-negative constants C and $\gamma \geq 1$ such that for any $x \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$|g_1(x)| + |g_2(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^\gamma) \tag{2.6}$$

(ii) For any fixed $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}$, $\mathbf{E}_{t,x}^{u,v}$ is the expectation under the probability $\mathbf{P}_{t,x}^{u,v}$; hereafter $\mathbf{E}_{0,x}^{u,v}(.)$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}_{0,x}^{u,v}$) will be simply denoted by $\mathbf{E}_x^{u,v}(.)$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}_x^{u,v}$).

As we can see from (2.4) and (2.5), the choice of control of each player has influence on the other one's payoff through the state process X^{0,x_0} under $\mathbf{P}_{x_0}^{u,v}$. What we discussed here is a nonzero-sum stochastic differential game which means that the two players are of cooperate relationship. Both of them want to reach the maximum payoff. Therefore, naturally, we are concerned with the existence of a *Nash equilibrium point*, which is a couple of controls $(u^*, v^*) \in \mathcal{M}$, such that, for all $(u,v) \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$J_1(u^*,v^*) \geq J_1(u,v^*) \text{ and } J_2(u^*,v^*) \geq J_2(u^*,v).$$

This means that when the strategy (u^*, v^*) is implemented by the players, one who makes unilaterally the decision to deviate or to change a strategy, while the other one keeps its own choice, is penalized. □

2.2. Bang-bang type control. As pointed out in (2.5), there are no instantaneous payoffs in J_1 and J_2. Therefore, in comparison with optimal control which is a particular case of our problem (see e.g. [2, 3, 13, 28]), the equilibrium point of this game, if exists, should be of bang-bang type, *i.e.*, the optimal control u^* (resp.v^*) will jump between the two bounds of the value set U (resp.V).

To proceed, let H_1 and H_2 be the *Hamiltonian functions* of this game problem, *i.e.*, the functions (which do not depend on ω) defined from $[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}\times U\times V$ into $\mathbf{R}$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(t,x,p,u,v) &:= p\Gamma(t,x,u,v) = p(f(t,x)+u+v);\\ H_2(t,x,q,u,v) &:= q\Gamma(t,x,u,v) = q(f(t,x)+u+v). \end{aligned}$$

Next let ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 be two arbitrary elements of U and V respectively. Let $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$ be two functions defined on $\mathbf{R}\times U$ and $\mathbf{R}\times V$, valued on U and V respectively, as follows: $\forall p,q\in\mathbf{R}$,

$$\bar{u}(p,\epsilon_1)=\begin{cases} 1, & p>0,\\ \epsilon_1, & p=0,\\ 0, & p<0, \end{cases} \quad\text{and}\quad \bar{v}(q,\epsilon_2)=\begin{cases} 1, & q>0,\\ \epsilon_2, & q=0,\\ -1, & q<0. \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

Then, we can easily check that $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$ satisfy the *generalized Isaacs' condition* which reads as follows: $\forall\ (t,x,p,q,u,v)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}\times U\times V$,

$$\begin{cases} H_1^*(t,x,p,q,\epsilon_2) := H_1(t,x,p,\bar{u}(p,\epsilon_1),\bar{v}(q,\epsilon_2)) \geq H_1(t,x,p,u,\bar{v}(q,\epsilon_2)) \text{ and}\\ H_2^*(t,x,p,q,\epsilon_1) := H_2(t,x,q,\bar{u}(p,\epsilon_1),\bar{v}(q,\epsilon_2)) \geq H_2(t,x,q,\bar{u}(p,\epsilon_1),v). \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

REMARK 2.2. *Let us notice that the function H_1^* (resp. H_2^*) does not depend on ϵ_1 (resp. ϵ_2) since, $p\bar{u}(p,\epsilon_1)=p\vee 0$ (resp. $q\bar{v}(q,\epsilon_2)=|q|$) does not depend on ϵ_1 (resp. ϵ_2). Besides, they are discontinuous w.r.t. (p,q) since $\bar{v}$ and $\bar{u}$ are so.*

We next give the main result of this article without proofs for intuitive understanding. All the proofs are given in Subsection 2.4.

2.3. Main result. As in several papers on the same subject ([14, 20, 23], etc.), we will adopt the BSDE approach in order to show that this particular nonzero-sum stochastic differential game has a Nash equilibrium point. For sake of clarity, in this subsection we give the main result and the intermediary ones which we need. We collect all their proofs in the next subsection. To begin with, the following result characterizes the payoffs (2.5) through a solution of a multidimensional BSDE.

PROPOSITION 2.3. *Assume that (2.2) and (2.6) are satisfied. Then for all $(u,v)\in\mathcal{M}$ and $i=1,2$, there exists a unique pair of $\mathcal{P}$-measurable processes $(Y^{i;x_0;u,v}, Z^{i;x_0;u,v})$, with values in $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{R}$, such that: For $i=1,2$,*
(i) *for all constant $q\geq 1$,*

$$\boldsymbol{E}_{x_0}^{u,v}\Big[\sup_{s\in[0,T]}|Y_s^{i;x_0;u,v}|^q+(\int_0^T|Z_s^{i;x_0;u,v}|^2ds)^{\frac{q}{2}}\Big]<\infty. \tag{2.9}$$

(ii)

$$\begin{cases} -dY_t^{i;x_0;u,v}=H_i(s,X_s^{0,x_0},Z_s^{i;x_0;u,v},u_s,v_s)ds-Z_s^{i;x_0;u,v}dB_s,\ s\leq T;\\ Y_T^{i;x_0;u,v}=g_i(X_T^{0,x_0}). \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

Moreover $Y_0^{i;x_0;u,v} = J_i(u,v)$. □

The following result is a verification theorem for the existence of NEP of the game of bang-bang type.

PROPOSITION 2.4. *Assume that (2.2) and (2.6) are satisfied. Besides, suppose that there exist two deterministic functions* η^1, η^2 *and stochastic processes* (Y^1, Z^1), (Y^2, Z^2) *and* θ, ϑ *such that:*

(i) (a) *θ (resp. ϑ) is a $\mathcal{P}$-measurable process with values in U (resp. V) and (Y^1, Z^1) and (Y^2, Z^2) are two couples of $\mathcal{P}$-measurable processes $\boldsymbol{R}^{1+1}$-valued which satisfy:*

(b) *for $i = 1, 2$ $\boldsymbol{P}$-a.s. $(Z_s^i(\omega))_{s\leq T}$ is ds-square integrable and for all $s \leq T$,*

$$\begin{cases} -dY_s^1 = H_1^*(s, X_s^{0,x_0}, Z_s^1, Z_s^2, \vartheta_s)ds - Z_s^1 dB_s,\ Y_T^1 = g_1(X_T^{0,x_0}); \\ -dY_s^2 = H_2^*(s, X_s^{0,x_0}, Z_s^1, Z_s^2, \theta_s)ds - Z_s^2 dB_s,\ Y_T^2 = g_2(X_T^{0,x_0}). \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

(ii) *η^1 and η^2 are two deterministic measurable functions with polynomial growth from $[0,T] \times \boldsymbol{R}$ to $\boldsymbol{R}$ such that $\boldsymbol{P}$-a.s., $\forall s \leq T$, $Y_s^i = \eta^i(s, X_s^{0,x_0})$.*

Then, the pair of controls $(\bar{u}(Z_s^1, \theta_s), \bar{v}(Z_s^2, \vartheta_s))_{s\leq T}$ is a bang-bang type Nash equilibrium point of the nonzero-sum stochastic differential game. □

Finally since the diffusion coefficient in equation (2.1) is equal to the identity and in using a result by El-Karoui et al. [15] which allows the representation of solutions of BSDEs through deterministic functions, in the markovian case of randomness, we prove the existence of processes and deterministic functions which satisfy the requirements of Proposition 2.4. The main difficulty relies on the discontinuity of the generator H_1^* (resp. H_2^*) w.r.t. (p,q) which comes from the discontinuity of $\bar{v}$ (resp. $\bar{u}$) on $q = 0$ (resp. $p = 0$). However we can overcome this difficulty and we have:

THEOREM 2.5. *Assume that f and g_i, $i = 1, 2$, satisfy to (2.2) and (2.6) respectively. Then there exist η^1, η^2, (Y^1, Z^1), (Y^2, Z^2) and θ, ϑ which satisfy (i),(a)-(b) and (ii) of Proposition 2.4.*

As a consequence of Theorem 2.5 and Proposition 2.4, we obtain the main result of this article.

THEOREM 2.6. *The pair $(\bar{u}(Z_s^1, \theta_s), \bar{v}(Z_s^2, \vartheta_s))_{s\leq T}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ is a bang-bang type Nash equilibrium point for the nonzero-sum stochastic differential game defined by (2.1), (2.3) and (2.5).*

2.4. Proofs.

2.4.1. Pre-results. We would like to introduce first two estimates about the process $X^{t,x}$ defined in (2.1) which will be used in order to prove the above results. They are related to moments of $X^{t,x}$ under the probabilities $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{P}^{u,v}$, $(u,v) \in \mathcal{M}$ (see. Karatzas, I.1991 [25], pp.306). Indeed we have:

$$\forall q \in [1, \infty), \quad \mathbf{E}\big[(\sup_{s\leq T} |X_s^{t,x}|)^q\big] \leq C(1 + |x|^q) \tag{2.12}$$

and for any $(u,v) \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\forall q \in [1, \infty), \quad \mathbf{E}_{t,x}^{u,v}\big[(\sup_{s\leq T} |X_s^{t,x}|)^q\big] \leq C(1 + |x|^q). \tag{2.13}$$

Finally let us recall the following important result by U.G.Hausmann (see Theorem 2.2, pp.14 [24]) related to the integrability of the exponential local martingale defined by (2.3).

LEMMA 2.7. *([24], pp.14) Let Θ be a $\mathcal{P}\otimes\mathcal{B}(\boldsymbol{R})$-measurable application from $[0,T]\times\Omega\times\boldsymbol{R}$ to $\boldsymbol{R}$ which is of uniformly linear growth, that is, $\boldsymbol{P}$-a.s. $\forall(s,x)\in[0,T]\times\boldsymbol{R}$, $|\Theta(s,\omega,x)|\leq C_0(1+|x|)$. Then, there exist constants $p\in(1,2)$ and C, where p depends only on C_0 while the constant C, depends only on p, but not on Θ, such that:*

$$\boldsymbol{E}\Big[\Big(\zeta_T\{\Theta(s,X_s^{t,x})\}\Big)^p\Big]\leq C,$$

where the process $\zeta_T(.)$ is the density function defined by (2.3).

As a by-product we have:

COROLLARY 2.8. *For any admissible control $(u,v)\in\mathcal{M}$ and $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\boldsymbol{R}$, there exists a constant $p\in(1,2)$ such that:*

$$\boldsymbol{E}\Big[\Big(\zeta_T\{\Gamma(s,X_s^{t,x},u_s,v_s)\}\Big)^p\Big]\leq C.$$

2.4.2. Proof of Proposition 2.3. We will prove this Proposition by constructing the candidate solution of BSDE (2.10) directly. Then we check by Itô's formula that, the process defined is exactly the solution we anticipate. In this proof, Corollary 2.8 plays an important role. Let us illustrate it for player π_1. The same can be done for player π_2.

For simplicity, only in this proof, we use the notation $(Y^{u,v},Z^{u,v})$ instead of $(Y^{1;x_0;u,v},Z^{1;x_0;u,v})$.

For any $(u,v)\in\mathcal{M}$, let us define the process $(Y_s^{u,v})_{s\leq T}$ as follows:

$$Y_s^{u,v}:=\mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,v}[g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})|\mathcal{F}_s],\quad\forall s\leq T. \tag{2.14}$$

This process is well defined by noticing that, for any constant $q\geq 1$, we have $\mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,v}[|g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})|^q]\leq C\mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,v}[C(1+\sup_{s\leq T}|X_s^{0,x_0}|^{q\gamma})]<\infty$ which is obtained by (2.6) and (2.13). For writing convenience, we denote by ζ_s, the function $\zeta_s(\Gamma(.,X_.^{0,x_0},u_.,v_.))$ as mentioned in (2.3). Therefore (2.14) can be transformed into:

$$Y_s^{u,v}=\zeta_s^{-1}\mathbf{E}[\zeta_T\cdot g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})|\mathcal{F}_s],\quad\forall s\leq T.$$

In the following, we show that $\zeta_T\cdot g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})\in L^{\bar{q}}$ for some $\bar{q}\in(1,2)$. Indeed, according to Corollary 2.8, there exists some $p_0\in(1,2)$, such that $\zeta_T\in L^{p_0}(d\mathbf{P})$. Therefore, for any $\bar{q}\in(1,p_0)$, Young's inequality leads to:

$$\mathbf{E}[|\zeta_T\cdot g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})|^{\bar{q}}]\leq\tfrac{\bar{q}}{p_0}\mathbf{E}[|\zeta_T|^{p_0}]+\tfrac{p_0-\bar{q}}{p_0}\mathbf{E}[|g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})|^{\bar{q}\cdot\frac{p_0}{p_0-\bar{q}}}],$$

which is obviously finite by the polynomial growth of g_1 and (2.12). Therefore the process $Y^{u,v}$ is defined. On the other hand, by Doob's inequality, (2.6) and estimate (2.13) we have:

$$\forall q>1,\mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,v}[\sup_{s\leq T}|Y_s^{u,v}|^q]\leq C\mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,v}[|g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})|^q]\leq C(1+|x_0|^q). \tag{2.15}$$

Next thanks to representation Theorem of martingales ([32], pp.199) applied to the process $(\mathbf{E}[\zeta_T\cdot g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})|\mathcal{F}_s])_{s\leq T}$, there exists a $\mathcal{P}$-measurable and $\mathbf{R}$-valued process $(\Delta_s)_{s\leq T}$ which satisfies $\mathbf{E}[(\int_0^T|\Delta_s|^2ds)^{\frac{\bar{q}}{2}}]<\infty$ and

$$Y_s^{u,v} = \zeta_s^{-1}\{\mathbf{E}[\zeta_T \cdot g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})] + \int_0^s \Delta_r dB_r\} := \zeta_s^{-1} R_s, \quad \forall s \le T,$$

with $R_s := \mathbf{E}[\zeta_T \cdot g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})|\mathcal{F}_s] = \mathbf{E}[\zeta_T \cdot g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})] + \int_0^s \Delta_r dB_r$. Next let us set

$$Z_s^{u,v} := -\zeta_s^{-1}\big\{R_s\Gamma(s, X_s^{0,x_0}, u_s, v_s) - \Delta_s\big\},\ s \le T. \tag{2.16}$$

As for any $s \in [0,T]$,

$$d\zeta_s = \zeta_s \cdot \Gamma(s, X_s^{0,x_0}, u_s, v_s) dB_s$$

then by Itô's formula applied to $\zeta^{-1}R$, one can easily check that $(Y^{u,v}, Z^{u,v})$ verifies (2.10) for $i = 1$. The same happens for $i = 2$.

Now for any $(u,v) \in \mathcal{M}$ and $s \le T$, if $(B_s^{u,v})_{s\le T}$ is the Brownian motion under $\mathbf{P}_{x_0}^{u,v}$, we then deduce from (2.10) that

$$-dY_s^{i;x_0;u,v} = -Z_s^{i;x_0;u,v} dB_s^{u,v},\ \ Y_T^{i;x_0;u,v} = g_i(X_T^{0,x_0})$$

and $Y_0^{i;x_0;u,v} = \mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,v}[g_i(X_T^{0,x_0}] = J_i(u,v)$ since $\mathcal{F}_0$ is the trivial σ-algebra completed with the $\mathbf{P}$-null sets of $\mathcal{F}$ and taking into account that $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{P}_{x_0}^{u,v}$ are equivalent probabilities. Therefore taking into account of (2.15) and using the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality we have

$$\forall q > 1, \mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,v}[(\int_0^T |Z_r^{i;x_0;u,v}|^2 dr)^{\frac{q}{2}}] < \infty.$$

This and (2.15) imply the estimate (2.9) of Proposition 2.3 for $q > 1$. Finally for $q = 1$, (2.9) is obviously true since it is valid for any $q > 1$. The proof of the Proposition 2.3 is completed. □

2.4.3. Proof of Proposition 2.4. For $s \le T$, let us set $\bar{u}_s = \bar{u}(Z_s^1, \theta_s)$ and $\bar{v}_s = \bar{v}(Z_s^2, \vartheta_s)$, then $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in \mathcal{M}$. On the other hand, thanks to Proposition 2.3, we obviously have $Y_0^1 = J_1(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$.

Next let u be an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{M}_1$ and let us show that $Y^1 \ge Y^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}}$, which yields $Y_0^1 = J_1(\bar{u},\bar{v}) \ge Y_0^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}} = J^1(u,\bar{v})$.

The control $(u,\bar{v})$ is admissible and thanks to Proposition 2.3, there exists a pair of $\mathcal{P}$-measurable processes $(Y^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}}, Z^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}})$ such that for any $q > 1$,

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,\bar{v}}\Big[\sup\limits_{0\le s\le T} |Y_s^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}}|^q + \big(\int_0^T |Z_s^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}}|^2 ds\big)^{\frac{q}{2}}\Big] < \infty\,; \\ Y_s^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}} = g_1(X_T^{0,x_0}) + \int_s^T H_1(r, X_r^{0,x_0}, Z_r^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}}, u_r, \bar{v}_r)dr - \int_s^T Z_r^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}} dB_r, \\ \qquad\qquad \forall s \le T. \end{cases} \tag{2.17}$$

Afterwards, we aim to compare Y^1 in (2.11) and $Y^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}}$ in (2.17). So let us denote by

$$\triangle Y = Y^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}} - Y^1 \text{ and } \triangle Z = Z^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}} - Z^1.$$

For $k \ge 0$, we define the stopping time τ_k as follows:

$$\tau_k := \inf\{s \ge 0, |\triangle Y_s| + \textstyle\int_0^s |\triangle Z_r|^2 dr \ge k\} \wedge T.$$

The sequence of stopping times $(\tau_k)_{k\geq 0}$ is of stationary type and converges to T. Next applying Itô-Meyer formula to $|(\triangle Y)^+|^q$ $(q>1)$ (see Theorem 71, P. Protter, [30], pp.221), between $s\wedge\tau_k$ and τ_k, we obtain: $\forall s\leq T$,

(2.18)

$$\begin{aligned}
&|(\triangle Y_{s\wedge\tau_k})^+|^q + c(q)\int_{s\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|(\triangle Y_r)^+|^{q-2}1_{\triangle Y_r>0}|\triangle Z_r|^2dr\\
&\quad = |(\triangle Y_{\tau_k})^+|^q + q\int_{s\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|(\triangle Y_r)^+|^{q-1}1_{\triangle Y_r>0}\big[H_1(r,X_r^{0,x_0},Z_r^{1;x_0;u,\bar v},u_r,\bar v_r)-\\
&\qquad H_1(r,X_r^{0,x_0},Z_r^1,\bar u_r,\bar v_r)\big]dr - q\int_{s\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|(\triangle Y_r)^+|^{q-1}1_{\triangle Y_r>0}\triangle Z_r dB_r
\end{aligned}$$

where $c(q)=\frac{1}{2}q(q-1)$. Besides for any $s\leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_1(s,X_s^{0,x_0},Z_s^{1;x_0;u,\bar v},u_s,\bar v_s) - H_1(s,X_s^{0,x},Z_s^1,\bar u_s,\bar v_s) =\\
H_1(s,X_s^{0,x_0},Z_s^{1;x_0;u,\bar v},u_s,\bar v_s) - H_1(s,X_s^{0,x_0},Z_s^1,u_s,\bar v_s)\\
+ H_1(s,X_s^{0,x_0},Z_s^1,u_s,\bar v_s) - H_1(s,X_s^{0,x_0},Z_s^1,\bar u_s,\bar v_s)
\end{aligned}$$

Considering now the generalized Isaacs' condition (2.8), we have

$$H_1(s,X_s^{0,x_0},Z_s^1,u_s,\bar v_s) - H_1(s,X_s^{0,x_0},Z_s^1,\bar u_s,\bar v_s)\leq 0,\quad \forall s\leq T.$$

Additionally

$$H_1(s,X_s^{0,x_0},Z_s^{1;x_0;u,\bar v},u_s,\bar v_s) - H_1(s,X_s^{0,x_0},Z_s^1,u_s,\bar v_s) = \triangle Z_s\Gamma(s,X_s^{0,x_0},u_s,\bar v_s).$$

Thus equation (2.18) can be simplified into: $\forall s\in[0,T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|(\triangle Y_{s\wedge\tau_k})^+|^q + c(q)\int_{s\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|(\triangle Y_r)^+|^{q-2}1_{\triangle Y_r>0}|\triangle Z_r|^2dr\\
&\quad\leq |(\triangle Y_{\tau_k})^+|^q + q\int_{s\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|(\triangle Y_r)^+|^{q-1}\mathbb{1}_{\triangle Y_r>0}\triangle Z_r\Gamma(r,X_r^{0,x_0},u_r,\bar v_r)dr\\
&\qquad - q\int_{s\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|(\triangle Y_r)^+|^{q-1}1_{\triangle Y_r>0}\triangle Z_r dB_r\\
&\quad = |(\triangle Y_{\tau_k})^+|^q - q\int_{s\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|(\triangle Y_r)^+|^{q-1}1_{\triangle Y_r>0}\triangle Z_r dB_r^{u,\bar v},
\end{aligned}$$

where $B^{u,\bar v}=(B_s-\int_0^s\Gamma(r,X_r^{0,x_0},u_r,\bar v_r)dr)_{s\leq T}$ is an $(\mathcal{F}_s,\mathbf{P}_{x_0}^{u,\bar v})$-Brownian motion. Then for any $s\leq T$,

$$|(\triangle Y_{s\wedge\tau_k})^+|^q\leq |(\triangle Y_{\tau_k})^+|^q - q\int_{s\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|(\triangle Y_r)^+|^{q-1}1_{\triangle Y_r>0}\triangle Z_r dB_r^{u,\bar v}.$$

By definition of the stopping time τ_k, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,\bar v}\big[\int_{s\wedge\tau_k}^{\tau_k}|(\triangle Y_r)^+|^{q-1}1_{\triangle Y_r>0}\triangle Z_r dB_r^{u,\bar v}\big]=0.$$

Thus for any $s\leq T$,

$$\mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,\bar v}\big[|(\triangle Y_{s\wedge\tau_k})^+|^q\big]\leq \mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,\bar v}\big[|(Y_{\tau_k}^{1;x_0;u,\bar v}-Y_{\tau_k}^1)^+|^q\big]. \tag{2.19}$$

Next taking into account (2.13) and the fact that Y^1 has a representation through X^{0,x_0} and $\eta^1(s,y)$, $(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}$, a deterministic function with polynomial growth, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_{x_0}^{u,\bar v}\Big[\sup_{s\leq T}(|Y_s^1|+|Y_s^{1;x_0;u,\bar v}|)^q\Big]<\infty \tag{2.20}$$

As the sequence $((Y^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}}_{\tau_k} - Y^1_{\tau_k})^+)_{k\geq 0}$ converges to 0 when $k \to \infty$, $\mathbf{P}^{u,\bar{v}}_{x_0}$-a.s., since $\lim_{k\to\infty} Y^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}}_{\tau_k} = \lim_{k\to\infty} Y^1_{\tau_k} = g_1(X^{0,x}_T)$ $\mathbf{P}^{u,\bar{v}}_{x_0}$-a.s.. Then it converges also to 0 in $L^1(d\mathbf{P}^{u,\bar{v}}_{x_0})$ thanks to (2.20). Take now $k \to \infty$ on (2.19), it follows from Fatou's Lemma that:

$$\mathbf{E}^{u,\bar{v}}_{x_0}\left[(\triangle Y_s)^+\right] = 0,\ \forall s \leq T,$$

which implies that $Y^1 \geq Y^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}}$, $\mathbf{P}$-a.s., since the probabilities $\mathbf{P}^{u,\bar{v}}_{x_0}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are equivalent. Thus $Y^1_0 = J^1(\bar{u},\bar{v}) \geq Y^{1;x_0;u,\bar{v}}_0 = J^1(u,\bar{v})$.

Similarly, we can show that, $Y^2_0 = J^2(\bar{u},\bar{v}) \geq Y^{2;x_0;\bar{u},v}_0 = J^2(\bar{u},v)$ for arbitrary $v \in \mathcal{M}_2$. Henceforth $(\bar{u},\bar{v})$ is a Nash equilibrium point for the NZSDG. □

2.4.4. Proof of Theorem 2.5. The proof will be split into several steps. Firstly, we construct an approximating sequence of BSDEs with continuous Lipschitz generators by smoothing the functions $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$. Next we provide appropriate uniform estimates of the solutions of the approximating scheme. Finally we show that the approximating scheme contains at least a convergent subsequence which provides the stochastic processes and deterministic functions verifying the requirements of Proposition 2.4.

Step 1: Approximating scheme.

At the beginning of this proof, we would like to clarify that the functions $p \in \mathbf{R} \mapsto p\bar{u}(p,\epsilon_1)$ and $q \in \mathbf{R} \mapsto q\bar{v}(q,\epsilon_2)$ are uniformly Lipschitz for any ϵ_1 and ϵ_2, since $p\bar{u}(p,\epsilon_1) = p\bar{u}(p,0) = \sup_{u\in U} pu$ and $q\bar{v}(q,\epsilon_2) = q\bar{v}(q,0) = \sup_{v\in V} qv$. Hereafter $\bar{u}(p,0)$ (resp. $\bar{v}(q,0)$) will be simply denoted by $\bar{u}(p)$ (resp. $\bar{v}(q)$).

Next for integer $n \geq 1$, let $\bar{u}^n$ and $\bar{v}^n$ be the functions defined as follows:

$$\bar{u}^n(p) = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if } p \leq -1/n, \\ 1 \text{ if } p \geq 0, \\ np+1 \text{ if } p \in (-1/n, 0), \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{v}^n(q) = \begin{cases} -1 \text{ if } q \leq -1/n, \\ 1 \text{ if } q \geq 1/n, \\ nq \text{ if } q \in (-1/n, 1/n). \end{cases}$$

Note that $\bar{u}^n$ and $\bar{v}^n$ are Lipschitz in p and q respectively. Roughly speaking, they are the approximations of $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$. Below, let Φ_n be the truncation function $x \in \mathbf{R} \mapsto \Phi_n(x) = (x \wedge n) \vee (-n) \in \mathbf{R}$, which is bounded by n. Now for $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}$ and $n \geq 1$, we consider the following BSDE of dimension two, with Lipschitz generator: For any $s \leq T$,

$$\begin{cases} -dY^{1,n;t,x}_s = \{\Phi_n(Z^{1,n;t,x}_r)\Phi_n(f(r,X^{t,x}_r)) + \Phi_n(Z^{1,n;t,x}_r\bar{u}(Z^{1,n;t,x}_r))+ \\ \qquad\qquad \Phi_n(Z^{1,n;t,x}_r)\bar{v}^n(Z^{2,n;t,x}_r)\}dr - Z^{1,n;t,x}_r dB_r,\ Y^{1,n;t,x}_T = g_1(X^{t,x}_T); \\ -dY^{2,n;t,x}_s = \{\Phi_n(Z^{2,n;t,x}_r)\Phi_n(f(r,X^{t,x}_r)) + \Phi_n(Z^{2,n;t,x}_r\bar{v}(Z^{2,n;t,x}_r))+ \\ \qquad\qquad \Phi_n(Z^{2,n;t,x}_r)\bar{u}^n(Z^{1,n;t,x}_r)\}dr - Z^{2,n;t,x}_r dB_r,\ Y^{2,n;t,x}_T = g_2(X^{t,x}_T). \end{cases} \tag{2.21}$$

From Pardoux-Peng's result ([29]), for any $n \geq 1$, this equation has a unique solution $(Y^{i,n;t,x}, Z^{i,n;t,x}) \in \mathcal{S}^2_T(\mathbf{R}) \times \mathcal{H}^2_T(\mathbf{R})$, $i = 1,2$. Taking account of the result by El-Karoui et al.([15], pp.46, Theorem 4.1), there exist measurable deterministic functions $\eta^{i,n}$ and $\varsigma^{i,n}$, $i = 1,2$ and $n \geq 1$, defined on $[0,T] \times \mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{R}$-valued such that:

$$\forall s \in [t,T],\ Y^{i,n;t,x}_s = \eta^{i,n}(s, X^{t,x}_s) \quad \text{and} \quad Z^{i,n;t,x}_s = \varsigma^{i,n}(s, X^{t,x}_s). \tag{2.22}$$

Moreover, for $n \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$, the functions $\eta^{i,n}$ verify:

$$\forall (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R},\ \eta^{i,n}(t,x) = \mathbf{E}[g_i(X_T^{t,x})] + \int_t^T H_i^n(r, X_r^{t,x})dr] \tag{2.23}$$

with, for any $(s,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}$,

$$\begin{cases} H_1^n(s,x) = \Phi_n(\varsigma^{1,n}(s,x))\Phi_n(f(s,x)) + \Phi_n\big(\varsigma^{1,n}(s,x)\bar{u}(\varsigma^{1,n}(s,x))\big) + \\ \qquad\qquad + \Phi_n(\varsigma^{1,n}(s,x))\bar{v}^n(\varsigma^{2,n}(s,x)); \\ H_2^n(s,x) = \Phi_n(\varsigma^{2,n}(s,x))\Phi_n(f(s,x)) + \Phi_n\big(\varsigma^{2,n}(s,x)\bar{v}(\varsigma^{2,n}(s,x))\big) + \\ \qquad\qquad + \Phi_n(\varsigma^{2,n}(s,x))\bar{u}^n(\varsigma^{1,n}(s,x)). \end{cases} \tag{2.24}$$

Step 2: Estimates for processes $(Y^{i,n;t,x}, Z^{i,n;t,x}), i = 1, 2$.

In order to show the needed uniform estimates for $Y^{i,n;t,x}$ of BSDE (2.21), we use comparison. For that let us consider the following BSDE: For $i = 1, 2$ and any $s \in [0,T]$,

$$\bar{Y}_s^{i,n} = g_i(X_T^{t,x}) + \int_s^T \{\Phi_n(C(1 + |X_r^{t,x}|))|\bar{Z}_r^{i,n}| + C|\bar{Z}_r^{i,n}|\}dr - \int_s^T \bar{Z}_r^{i,n} dB_r, \tag{2.25}$$

where the constant C is the one such that the generators $(H_i^n(s, X_s^{t,x}))_{s \leq T}$ satisfy

$$\forall s \leq T,\ |H_i^n(s, X_s^{t,x})| \leq \Phi_n(C(1 + |X_s^{t,x}|))|Z_s^{i,n;t,x}| + C|Z_s^{i,n;t,x}|. \tag{2.26}$$

This constant exists since f is of linear growth and $\bar{u}$, $\bar{v}$, $\bar{u}^n$ and $\bar{v}^n$ are uniformly bounded. Observing now that the application $z \in \mathbf{R} \mapsto \Phi_n(C(1 + |X_r^{t,x}|))|z| + C|z|$ is Lipschitz continuous, therefore the solution $(\bar{Y}^{i,n}, \bar{Z}^{i,n})$ of the above BSDE (2.25) exists in the space $\mathcal{S}_T^2(\mathbf{R}) \times \mathcal{H}_T^2(\mathbf{R})$ and is unique. Note that we have omitted the dependence w.r.t (t,x) of $(\bar{Y}^{i,n}, \bar{Z}^{i,n})$ in order to alleviate notations as there is no possible confusion. On the other hand by the standard comparison theorem of solutions of BSDEs ([15], pp.46, Theorem 4.1) one has

$$\bar{Y}^{i,n} \geq Y^{i,n;t,x}, \mathbf{P} - a.s. \tag{2.27}$$

Next provided that we show uniform estimates, w.r.t. n, for $\bar{Y}^{i,n}$, then estimates for $Y^{i,n;t,x}$ will be an immediate consequence. Below, we will focus on the properties of $\bar{Y}^{i,n}$.

Using again the result by El Karoui et al. yields that, there exist deterministic measurable functions $\bar{\eta}^{i,n} : [0,T] \times \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ such that, for any $s \in [t,T]$,

$$\bar{Y}_s^{i,n} = \bar{\eta}^{i,n}(s, X_s^{t,x}),\ i = 1, 2. \tag{2.28}$$

Next let us consider the process
$B^{i,n} = (B_s - \int_0^s [\Phi_n(C(1 + |X_r^{t,x}|)) + C]\text{sign}(\bar{Z}_r^{i,n})dr)_{s \leq T}$, $i = 1, 2$, which is, thanks to Girsanov's Theorem, a Brownian motion under the probability $\mathbf{P}^{i,n}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ whose density with respect to $\mathbf{P}$ is $\zeta_T\{[\Phi_n(C(1 + |X_s^{t,x}|)) + C]\text{sign}(\bar{Z}_s^{i,n})\}$ where for any $z \in \mathbf{R}, \text{sign}(z) = 1_{\{|z| \neq 0\}} \frac{z}{|z|}$ and $\zeta_T(.)$ is defined by (2.3). Then the BSDE (2.25) will be simplified into,

$$\bar{Y}_s^{i,n} = g_i(X_T^{t,x}) - \int_s^T \bar{Z}_r^{i,n} dB_r^{i,n},\ s \leq T,\ i = 1, 2.$$

In view of (2.28), we obtain,

$$\bar{\eta}^{i,n}(t,x) = \mathbf{E}^{i,n}[g_i(X_T^{t,x})|\mathcal{F}_t],\ i=1,2,$$

where $\mathbf{E}^{i,n}$ is the expectation under probability $\mathbf{P}^{i,n}$. By taking the expectation on both sides of the above equation under the probability $\mathbf{P}^{i,n}$ and considering $\bar{\eta}^{i,n}(t,x)$ is deterministic, we arrive at,

$$\bar{\eta}^{i,n}(t,x) = \mathbf{E}^{i,n}[g_i(X_T^{t,x})],\ i=1,2.$$

As the functions g_i, $i=1,2$, verify the polynomial growth condition (2.6) and for any $s \le T$,

$$|\{\Phi_n(C(1+|X_s^{t,x}|)) + C\}\text{sign}(\bar{Z}_s^{i,n})| \le \bar{C}(1+|X_s^{t,x}|$$

then by estimate (2.13) we have, for some constant $\lambda \ge 0$ and C a constant which does not depend on n,

$$|\bar{\eta}^{i,n}(t,x)| \le C(1+|x|^\lambda).$$

Therefore by (2.27) we obtain $\eta^{i,n}(t,x) \le C(1+|x|^\lambda)$, for any $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbf{R}$. In a similar way, we can show that $\eta^{i,n}(t,x) \ge -C(1+|x|^\lambda)$, $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}$. Therefore, $\eta^{i,n},\ i=1,2$ are of polynomial growth with respect to (t,x) uniformly in n.

To conclude this step, we have the following results: There exists a constant C independent of n and t,x such that, for $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}$, $i=1,2$,

(2.29)

$$\begin{cases} \text{(a) } |\eta^{i,n}(t,x)| \le C(1+|x|^\lambda),\ \text{for any } \lambda \ge 0; \\ \text{(b) by the combination of (a), (2.12) with (2.22), it holds:} \\ \qquad \forall \alpha \ge 1,\ \mathbf{E}[\sup\limits_{s\in[t,T]} |Y_s^{i,n;t,x}|^\alpha] \le C\,; \\ \text{(c) for any } (t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R},\ \mathbf{E}[\int_t^T |Z_s^{i,n;t,x}|^2 ds] \le C \text{ which is a} \\ \qquad \text{straightforward result by using Itô's formula with } (Y^{i,n;t,x})^2 \text{ and using (b).} \end{cases}$$

Step 3: Convergence of a subsequence of $(Y^{i,n;0,x}, Z^{i,n;0,x})_{n\ge1}$, $i=1,2$.

First let us define on $\mathbf{R}$ the measure $\mu(0,x_0;s,dy)$ as the law under $\mathbf{P}$ of X_s^{0,x_0}, i.e., $\mu(0,x_0;s,dy) := \mathbf{P}(X_s^{0,x_0}\in dy) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s}} e^{-\frac{(y-x_0)^2}{2s}} dy$ for any $s\in(0,T]$.

Let $q\in(1,2)$ be fixed. We are going to show that the sequence $(H_i^n(s,y))_{n\ge1}$ belongs to $L^q([0,T]\times\mathbf{R};\mu(0,x_0;s,dy)ds)$, $i=1,2$. Actually,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\int_0^T |H_i^n(s,X_s^{0,x_0})|^q ds] &= \int_{[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}} |H_i^n(s,y)|^q \mu(0,x_0;s,dy)ds \\ &\le C\mathbf{E}[\int_0^T |Z_s^{i,n;0,x_0}|^q (1+|X_s^{0,x}|^q) ds] \\ &\le C\{\mathbf{E}[\int_0^T |Z_s^{i,n;0,x_0}|^2 ds] + \mathbf{E}[1+\sup_{s\in[0,T]} |X_s^{0,x_0}|^{\frac{2q}{2-q}}]\} \le C \end{aligned}$$

(2.30)

(C is a generic constant whose value may change from line to line). The last inequality is obtained from the fact that $\mathbf{E}[\int_0^T |Z_s^{i,n;0,x_0}|^2 ds] \leq C$ and estimate (2.12). As a result, there exists a subsequence $\{n_k\}$ (still denoted by $\{n\}$ for simplification) and two $\mathcal{B}([0,T]\times\mathbf{R})$-measurable deterministic functions $H_i(s,y)$, $i=1,2$, such that,

$$H_i^n \rightharpoonup H_i \text{ weakly in } L^q([0,T]\times\mathbf{R};\mu(0,x_0;s,dy)ds). \tag{2.31}$$

Next we focus on passing from the weak convergence to strong sense convergence by proving that $(\eta^{i,n}(t,x))_{n\geq 1}$ defined in (2.23) is a Cauchy sequence for each $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}$, $i=1,2$. Let (t,x) be fixed in $[0,T)\times\mathbf{R}$ (w.l.o.g we assume $t<T$), $\delta>0, k, n$ and $m\geq 1$ be integers. From (2.23), we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\eta^{i,n}(t,x)-\eta^{i,m}(t,x)| &= \big|\mathbf{E}[\int_t^T H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})-H_i^m(s,X_s^{t,x})ds]\big| \\
&\leq \big|\mathbf{E}[\int_t^{t+\delta} H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})-H_i^m(s,X_s^{t,x})ds]\big| \\
&\quad+\big|\mathbf{E}[\int_{t+\delta}^T (H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})-H_i^m(s,X_s^{t,x}))\cdot 1_{\{|X_s^{t,x}|\leq k\}}ds]\big| \\
&\quad+\big|\mathbf{E}[\int_{t+\delta}^T (H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})-H_i^m(s,X_s^{t,x}))\cdot 1_{\{|X_s^{t,x}|> k\}}ds]\big|.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

We first deal with the first term of the right-hand side of (2.32). By Hölder's inequality, definition of $H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})$ and (2.29) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|\mathbf{E}[\textstyle\int_t^{t+\delta} H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})-H_i^m(s,X_s^{t,x})ds]\big| \\
&\qquad\leq \mathbf{E}[\textstyle\int_t^{t+\delta}|H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})-H_i^m(s,X_s^{t,x})|ds] \\
&\qquad\leq C\mathbf{E}[\textstyle\int_t^{t+\delta}|Z_s^{i,n;t,x}|(1+|X_s^{t,x}|)ds] \\
&\qquad\leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{4}}\{\mathbf{E}[\textstyle\int_t^T|Z_s^{i,n;t,x}|^2ds]\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\{\mathbf{E}[\textstyle\int_t^T(1+|X_s^{t,x}|)^4ds]\}^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
&\qquad\leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{4}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now focus on the third term of the right hand-side of inequality (2.32). In the same way as previous we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\mathbf{E}\quad &[\textstyle\int_{t+\delta}^T(H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})-H_i^m(s,X_s^{t,x}))\cdot 1_{\{|X_s^{t,x}|>k\}}ds]\big| \\
&\leq \mathbf{E}[\textstyle\int_{t+\delta}^T|H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})-H_i^m(s,X_s^{t,x})|\cdot 1_{\{|X_s^{t,x}|>k\}}ds] \\
&\leq C\{\mathbf{E}[\textstyle\int_{t+\delta}^T 1_{\{|X_s^{t,x}|>k\}}ds]\}^{\frac{1}{4}}\{\mathbf{E}[\textstyle\int_t^T|Z_s^{i,n;t,x}|^2ds]\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\{\mathbf{E}[\textstyle\int_t^T(1+|X_s^{t,x}|)^4ds]\}^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
&\leq Ck^{-\frac{1}{4}}
\end{aligned}$$

by using Markov inequality. Finally we deal with the second term of the right-hand side of (2.32). By using the law of $X_s^{t,x}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}[\int_{t+\delta}^T (H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})-H_i^m(s,X_s^{t,x}))\cdot 1_{\{|X_s^{t,x}|\leq k\}}ds] \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{t+\delta}^T (H_i^n(s,y)-H_i^m(s,y))1_{\{|y|\leq k\}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-t)}}e^{-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2(s-t)}}dsdy \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{t+\delta}^T (H_i^n(s,y)-H_i^m(s,y))1_{\{|y|\leq k\}}\Phi_{t,x,x_0}(s,y)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s}}e^{-\frac{(y-x_0)^2}{2s}}dy
\end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

where

$$\Phi_{t,x,x_0}(s,y)=\frac{\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{s-t}}e^{-\frac{(y-x)^2t}{2(s-t)}+\frac{(y-x_0)^2}{2s}}$$

which is bounded when $s\in[t+\delta,T]$ and $|y|\le k$ and then $\Phi_{t,x,x_0}(s,y)1_{[t+\delta,T]\times[-k,k]}(s,y)$ belongs $L^{\bar q}([0,T]\times\mathbf{R};\mu(0,x_0;s,dy)ds)$ with $\bar q$ is the conjugate of q. Now as the sequence of functions $(H_i^n)_{n\ge1}$ converges weakly in $L^q([0,T]\times\mathbf{R};\mu(0,x_0;s,dy)ds)$ then

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{E}[\textstyle\int_{t+\delta}^T(H_i^n(s,X_s^{t,x})-H_i^m(s,X_s^{t,x}))\cdot1_{\{|X_s^{t,x}|\le k\}}ds]\\&=\textstyle\int_{\mathbf{R}}\int_{t+\delta}^T(H_i^n(s,y)-H_i^m(s,y))1_{\{|y|\le k\}}\Phi_{t,x,x_0}(s,y)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s}}e^{-\frac{(y-x_0)^2}{2s}}dy\\&\to0\text{ as }n,m\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Henceforth for $i=1,2$, and any $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}$, the sequences $(\eta^{i,n}(t,x))_{n\ge1}$ is of Cauchy type and then converges to a deterministic measurable function $\eta^i(t,x)$. Additionally from the uniform polynomial growth of $\eta^{i,n}$ (see (a) of Step 2) we deduce that η^i is also of polynomial growth, i.e.,

$$\forall(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R},\ |\eta^i(t,x)|\le C(1+|x|^\lambda)\ (\lambda\ge0).\tag{2.34}$$

Next it turns out that, for $i=1,2$ and any $s\in[0,T]$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}Y_s^{i,n;0,x_0}(\omega)=\eta^i(s,X_s^{0,x_0}(\omega))\text{ and }|Y_s^{i,n;0,x_0}(\omega)|\le C(1+|X_s^{0,x_0}(\omega)|^\lambda),\ \mathbf{P}-a.s.$$

Setting $Y^i:=(\eta^i(s,X_s^{0,x_0}))_{s\le T}$, then by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem it holds

$$\mathbf{E}[\int_0^T|Y_s^{i,n;0,x_0}-Y_s^i|^\alpha ds]\to0,\quad\text{as }n\to\infty\quad\text{for any }\alpha\ge1\ (i=1,2).\tag{2.35}$$

It remains to show the convergence of sequences $((Z_s^{i,n;0,x_0})_{s\le T})_{n\ge1}$, $i=1,2$. Taking Itô's formula with $(Y^{i,n;0,x_0}-Y^{i,m;0,x_0})^2$ and considering (2.2), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}&|Y_s^{i,n;0,x_0}-Y_s^{i,m;0,x_0}|^2+\int_s^T|Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0}-Z_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|^2ds\\&\le2\int_s^TC|Y_r^{i,n;0,x_0}-Y_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|(1+|X_r^{0,x_0}|)(|Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0}|+|Z_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|)dr\\&\quad-2\int_s^T(Y_r^{i,n;0,x_0}-Y_r^{i,m;0,x_0})(Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0}-Z_r^{i,m;0,x_0})dB_r,\ \forall s\le T.\end{aligned}\tag{2.36}$$

Since for any $a,b,c\in\mathbf{R}$ and for any $\epsilon>0$, $|abc|\le\frac{\epsilon^2}{2}a^2+\frac{\epsilon^4}{4}b^4+\frac{1}{4\epsilon^8}c^4$, we then have: $\forall s\le T$,

$$\begin{aligned}&|Y_s^{i,n;0,x_0}-Y_s^{i,m;0,x_0}|^2+\int_s^T|Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0}-Z_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|^2dr\\&\le C\{\frac{\epsilon^2}{2}\int_s^T(|Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0}|+|Z_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|)^2dr+\frac{\epsilon^4}{4}\int_s^T(1+|X_r^{0,x_0}|)^4dr\\&\qquad+\frac{1}{4\epsilon^8}\int_s^T|Y_r^{i,n;0,x_0}-Y_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|^4dr\}\\&\quad-2\int_s^T(Y_r^{i,n;0,x_0}-Y_r^{i,m;0,x_0})(Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0}-Z_r^{i,m;0,x_0})dB_r.\end{aligned}\tag{2.37}$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, taking now $s = 0$, expectation on both hand-sides and the limit w.r.t. n, m, combining with (2.35), (2.12), (2.29)-(c) yields that,

$$\limsup_{n,m\to\infty} \mathbf{E}[\int_0^T |Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0} - Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0}|^2 dr] \to 0, \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{2.38}$$

Consequently, for $i = 1, 2$, the sequence $(Z^{i,n;0,x_0} = (\varsigma^{i,n}(t, X_t^{0,x}))_{t\le T})_{n\ge 1}$ is convergent in $\mathcal{H}_T^2(\mathbf{R})$ to a process Z^i which belongs also to $\mathcal{H}_T^2(\mathbf{R})$. On the other hand one can substract a subsequence which we still denote by $\{n\}$ such that $(Z_s^{i,n;0,x_0})_{n\ge1} \to Z_s^i$, $ds \otimes d\mathbf{P}$-a.e. and $\sup_{n\ge1} |Z_s^{i,n;0,x_0}|$ belongs to $L^2([0, T] \times \mathbf{R}, ds \otimes d\mathbf{P})$.

Next going back to inequality (2.37), taking the supremum on interval $[0, T]$ and using BDG's inequality, we deduce that,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\big[\sup_{s\in[0,T]} |Y_s^{i,n;0,x_0} - Y_s^{i,m;0,x_0}|^2 + \int_0^T |Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0} - Z_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|^2 dr\big] \\
&\le C\mathbf{E}\big\{\frac{\epsilon^2}{2}\int_0^T (|Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0}| + |Z_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|)^2 dr + \frac{\epsilon^4}{4}\int_0^T (1 + |X_r^{0,x_0}|)^4 dr \\
&\qquad + \frac{1}{4\epsilon^8}\int_0^T |Y_r^{i,n;0,x_0} - Y_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|^4 dr\big\} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\big[\sup_{r\in[0,T]} |Y_r^{i,n;0,x_0} - Y_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|^2\big] + 2\mathbf{E}\big[\int_0^T |Z_r^{i,n;0,x_0} - Z_r^{i,m;0,x_0}|^2 dr\big],
\end{aligned}$$

which implies,

$$\limsup_{n,m\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\big[\sup_{s\in[0,T]} |Y_s^{i,n;0,x_0} - Y_s^{i,m;0,x_0}|^2\big] = 0,$$

since ϵ is arbitrary and the facts of (2.12), (2.38), (2.35) and (2.29)-(c). Thus the sequence of processes $(Y^{i,n;0,x_0})_{n\ge1}$ converges in $\mathcal{S}_T^2(\mathbf{R})$ to Y^i for $i = 1, 2$ which are continuous processes.

To summarize this step, we have the following results (at least for a subsequence $\{n\}$): for $i = 1, 2$,

(2.39)

$$\begin{cases}
\text{(a) } H_i^n(s, y) \in L^q([0, T] \times \mathbf{R};\ \mu(0, x_0; s, dy)ds) \text{ uniformly w.r.t. } n; \\
\text{(b) } Y^{i,n;0,x_0} \to_{n\to\infty} Y^i \text{ in } L^\alpha([0, T] \times \mathbf{R}, ds \otimes d\mathbf{P}) \text{ for any } \alpha \ge 1, \text{ besides,} \\
\qquad Y^{i,n;0,x_0} \to_{n\to\infty} Y^i \text{ in } \mathcal{S}_T^2(\mathbf{R}); \\
\text{(c) } Z^{i,n;0,x_0} \to_{n\to\infty} Z^i \text{ in } L^2([0, T] \times \mathbf{R}, ds \otimes d\mathbf{P}), \text{ additionally, there exists a} \\
\qquad \text{subsequence } \{n\} \text{ s.t } Z^{i,n;0,x_0} \to_{n\to\infty} Z^i\ ds \otimes d\mathbf{P} - a.e. \text{ and} \\
\qquad \sup_{n\ge1} |Z^{i,n;0,x_0}| \in L^2([0, T] \times \mathbf{R}, ds \otimes d\mathbf{P}).
\end{cases}$$

Step 4: Convergence of $(H_i^n)_{n\ge1},\ i = 1, 2$.

In this step, we are going to define the processes $(\theta_s)_{s\le T}$ and $(\vartheta_s)_{s\le T}$ and verify that (Y^i, Z^i), $i = 1, 2$, and θ, ϑ satisfy (2.11). We demonstrate first for $i = 1$. Let us consider the subsequence which satisfies (2.39).

Recall (2.24) for $(t, x) = (0, x_0)$ which reads as: For any $s \in [t, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_1^n(s, X_s^{0,x_0}) = \Phi_n(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0})\Phi_n(f(s, X_s^{0,x_0})) + \Phi_n(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0}\bar{u}(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0})) \\
+ \Phi_n(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0})\bar{v}^n(Z_s^{2,n;0,x_0}).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that,

$$\Phi_n(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0})\Phi_n(f(s,X_s^{0,x_0}))+\Phi_n(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0}\bar{u}(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0}))$$
$$\to_{n\to\infty} Z_s^1 f(s,X_s^{0,x_0})+Z_s^1\bar{u}(Z_s^1),\ ds\otimes d\mathbf{P}\text{-a.e.}$$

since $Z^{1,n;0,x_0}\to_{n\to\infty} Z^1$, $ds\otimes d\mathbf{P}$-a.e. as stated in (2.39)-(c), $\Phi_n(x)\to_{n\to\infty} x$ and finally by the continuity of $p\in\mathbf{R}\mapsto p\bar{u}(p)$. This convergence holds also in $\mathcal{H}_T^1(\mathbf{R})$, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, since the process $(\sup_{n\geq 1}|Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0}|)_{s\in[t,T]}$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_T^2(\mathbf{R})$, f is of linear growth and $\bar{u}$ is uniformly bounded. The rest part in (2.40) is

$$\Phi_n(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0})\bar{v}^n(Z_s^{2,n;0,x_0})$$
$$=\Phi_n(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0})\bar{v}^n(Z_s^{2,n;0,x_0})1_{\{Z_s^2\neq 0\}}+\Phi_n(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0})\bar{v}^n(Z_s^{2,n;0,x_0})1_{\{Z_s^2=0\}}.$$

But

$$\Phi_n(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0})\bar{v}^n(Z_s^{2,n;0,x_0})1_{\{Z_s^2\neq 0\}}\to_{n\to\infty} Z_s^1\bar{v}(Z_s^2)1_{\{Z_s^2\neq 0\}}\quad ds\otimes d\mathbf{P}\text{-a.e.}$$

since for any $z\neq 0$, if n is large enough then $\bar{v}^n(z')=\bar{v}(z')$ if $z'\in(z-a,z+a)\subset(-\infty,0)\cup(0,+\infty)$ for small $a>0$ and $\bar{v}$ is continuous in z. Once more the convergence holds in $\mathcal{H}_T^2(\mathbf{R})$, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, since the process $(\sup_{n\geq 1}|Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0}|)_{s\in[t,T]}$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_T^2(\mathbf{R})$ and $\bar{v}^n$ is uniformly bounded.

To proceed let us define a $\mathcal{P}$-measurable process $(\vartheta_s)_{s\leq T}$ valued on V as the weak limit in $\mathcal{H}_T^2(\mathbf{R})$ of some subsequence $(\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0})1_{\{Z^2=0\}})_{k\geq 0}$. The weak limit exists since $(\bar{v}^{n_k})_{k\geq 0}$ is bounded. Let now τ be an arbitrary stopping time such that $\tau\in[0,T]$, $\mathbf{P}-a.s.$, then

$$\int_0^\tau \Phi_{n_k}(Z_s^{1,n_k;0,x_0})\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z_s^{2,n_k;0,x_0})1_{\{Z_s^2=0\}}ds$$
$$\to_{k\to\infty}\int_0^\tau Z_s^1\vartheta_s 1_{\{Z_s^2=0\}}ds \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Omega,d\mathbf{P}).$$

Indeed

$$\int_0^\tau \Phi_{n_k}(Z_s^{1,n_k;0,x_0})\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z_s^{2,n_k;0,x_0})1_{\{Z_s^2=0\}}ds$$
$$=\int_0^\tau(\Phi_{n_k}(Z_s^{1,n_k;0,x_0})-Z_s^1)\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z_s^{2,n_k;0,x_0})1_{\{Z_s^2=0\}}ds$$
$$+\int_0^\tau Z_s^1\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z_s^{2,n_k;0,x_0})1_{\{Z_s^2=0\}}ds.$$

On the right side, the first integral converges to 0 in $L^2(d\mathbf{P})$ by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem since $\Phi_{n_k}(Z^{1,n_k;0,x_0})\to Z^1$ $dt\otimes d\mathbf{P}$-a.e., $\sup_{k\geq 0}|Z_t^{1,n_k}|\in L^2([0,T]\times\mathbf{R})$ as shown in (2.39)-(c), $Z^1\in L^2([0,T]\times\mathbf{R})$, the sequence $(\bar{v}^{n_k})_{k\geq 0}$ is bounded and $|\Phi_{n_k}(x)|\leq|x|$, $\forall x\in\mathbf{R}$. Below, we will give the weak convergence in $L^2(\Omega,d\mathbf{P})$ of the integral $\int_0^\tau Z_s^1\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z_s^{2,n_k;0,x_0})1_{\{Z_s^2=0\}}ds$ to $\int_0^\tau Z_s^1\vartheta_s 1_{\{Z_s^2=0\}}ds$. That is, for any random variable $\xi\in L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_T,d\mathbf{P})$, we need to show,

$$\mathbf{E}[\xi\int_0^\tau Z_s^1\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z_s^{2,n_k;0,x_0})1_{\{Z_s^2=0\}}ds]\to_{k\to\infty}\mathbf{E}[\xi\int_0^\tau Z_s^1\vartheta_s 1_{\{Z_s^2=0\}}ds]. \tag{2.40}$$

Thanks to martingale representation theorem, there exists a process $(\Lambda_s)_{s\le T}\in\mathcal{H}^2_T(\mathbf{R})$ such that, $\mathbf{E}[\xi|\mathcal{F}_\tau]=\mathbf{E}[\xi]+\int_0^\tau \Lambda_s dB_s$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\Big[\xi\int_0^\tau Z^1_s\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}ds\Big]\\
&\quad=\mathbf{E}\Big[\mathbf{E}\big[\xi\int_0^\tau Z^1_s\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}ds|\mathcal{F}_\tau\big]\Big]\\
&\quad=\mathbf{E}\Big[\mathbf{E}[\xi|\mathcal{F}_\tau]\cdot\int_0^\tau Z^1_s\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}ds\Big]\\
&\quad=\mathbf{E}\Big[\mathbf{E}[\xi]\int_0^\tau Z^1_s\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}ds\Big]\\
&\qquad+\mathbf{E}\Big[\int_0^\tau\Lambda_s dB_s\cdot\int_0^\tau Z^1_s\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}ds\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\mathbf{E}[\xi]\mathbf{E}[\int_0^\tau Z^1_s\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}ds]\to_{k\to\infty}\mathbf{E}[\xi]\mathbf{E}[\int_0^\tau Z^1_s\vartheta_s 1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}ds]$, since $(Z^1_s)_{s\le T}\in\mathcal{H}^2_T(\mathbf{R})$ and $\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}\to_{k\to\infty}\vartheta_s$ weakly in $\mathcal{H}^2_T(\mathbf{R})$. Next, by Itô's formula,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}[\int_0^\tau\Lambda_s dB_s\cdot\int_0^\tau Z^1_s\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}ds]\\
&\quad=\mathbf{E}[\int_0^\tau\big(\int_0^s\Lambda_u dB_u\big)Z^1_s\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}ds]+\\
&\qquad+\mathbf{E}[\int_0^\tau\big(\int_0^s Z^1_u\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_u)1_{\{Z^2_u=0\}}du\big)\Lambda_s dB_s].
\end{aligned}$$

The latter one on the right side is 0, since $\int_0^\cdot(\int_0^s Z^1_u\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_u)1_{\{Z^2_u=0\}}du)\Lambda_s dB_s$ is an $\mathcal{F}_t$-martingale which is followed by $(Z^1_s)_{s\le T}\in\mathcal{H}^2_T(\mathbf{R})$, $(\Lambda_s)_{s\le T}\in\mathcal{H}^2_T(\mathbf{R})$ and the boundness of $\bar{v}^{n_k}$ and then
$\mathbf{E}[\{\int_0^T|\int_0^s Z^1_u\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_u)1_{\{Z^2_u=0\}}du|^2|\Lambda_s|^2ds\}^{\frac12}]<\infty$. For the former part, let us denote $\int_0^s\Lambda_u dB_u$ by ψ_s for any $s\in[0,\tau]$. Then for any integer $\kappa>0$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{E}[\int_0^\tau\psi_s Z^1_s\Big(\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}-\vartheta_s\Big)ds]|\\
&\quad=|\mathbf{E}[\int_0^\tau\psi_s Z^1_s\Big(\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}-\vartheta_s\Big)1_{\{|\psi_s Z^1_s|\le\kappa\}}ds]|+\\
&\qquad+|\mathbf{E}[\int_0^\tau\psi_s Z^1_s\Big(\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}-\vartheta_s\Big)1_{\{|\psi_s Z^1_s|>\kappa\}}ds]|.
\end{aligned}$$

On the right side of the above equation, the first component converges to 0 which is the consequence of $\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s)1_{\{Z^2_s=0\}}\to_{k\to\infty}\vartheta_s$ weakly in $\mathcal{H}^2_T(\mathbf{R})$. For the second term, considering both $(\bar{v}^{n_k}(Z^{2,n_k;0,x_0}_s))_{s\le\tau}$ and $(\vartheta_s)_{s\le\tau}$ are bounded, it is smaller than $C|\mathbf{E}[\int_0^\tau|\psi_s Z^1_s|1_{\{|\psi_s Z^1_s|\ge\kappa\}}ds]|$ which obviously converges to 0 as $\kappa\to\infty$. Thus (2.40) holds true.

Finally, we also have

$$\int_0^\tau Z^{1,n_k;0,x_0}_s dB_s\to_{k\to\infty}\int_0^\tau Z^1_s dB_s\text{ in }L^2(\Omega,d\mathbf{P}),\tag{2.41}$$

which is obtained from the convergence of $(Z^{1,n_k;0,x_0})_{k\ge0}$ to Z^1 in $\mathcal{H}^2_T(\mathbf{R})$.

Then by observing the approximation BSDE (2.21) in a forward way, *i.e.* for any stopping time τ,

$$Y_\tau^{1,n_k;0,x_0} = Y_0^{1,n_k;0,x_0} - \int_0^\tau H_1^{n_k}(s, X_s^{0,x_0})ds + \int_0^\tau Z_s^{1,n_k;0,x_0} dB_s,$$

combining with the convergence of $(Y^{1,n_k;0,x_0})_{k\geq 0}$ to Y^1 in $\mathcal{S}_T^2(\mathbf{R})$ we infer that

$$\mathbf{P}\text{-a.s., } Y_\tau^1 = Y_0^1 - \int_0^\tau H_1^*(s, X_s^{0,x_0}, Z_s^1, Z_s^2, \vartheta_s)ds + \int_0^\tau Z_s^1 dB_s$$

since

$$\int_0^\tau H_1^{n_k}(s, X_s^{0,x_0})ds \rightharpoonup_{k\to\infty} \int_0^\tau H_1^*(s, X_s^{0,x_0}, Z_s^1, Z_s^2, \vartheta_s)ds \text{ weakly in } L^2(\Omega, d\mathbf{P}).$$

As τ is arbitrary then the processes Y^1 and $Y_0^1 - \int_0^\cdot H_1^*(s, X_s^{0,x_0}, Z_s^1, Z_s^2, \vartheta_s)ds + \int_0^\cdot Z_s^1 dB_s$ are indistinguishable, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{P}$-a.s.

$$\forall s \leq T, \quad Y_s^1 = Y_0^1 - \int_0^s H_1^*(r, X_r^{0,x_0}, Z_r^1, Z_r^2, \vartheta_r)dr + \int_0^s Z_r^1 dB_r.$$

On the other hand, $Y_T^1 = g_1(X_T^{0,x_0})$, then,

$$\mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad \forall s \leq T, \quad Y_s^1 = g_1(X_T^{0,x_0}) + \int_s^T H_1^*(r, X_r^{0,x_0}, Z_r^1, Z_r^2, \vartheta_r)dr - \int_s^T Z_r^1 dB_r.$$

Similarly, for player π_2, there exists a $\mathcal{P}$-measurable process $(\theta_s)_{s\leq T}$ valued on U, which is obtained in the same way as previously as a weak limit of a subsequence of $(\bar{u}^n(Z_s^{1,n;0,x_0})1_{\{Z_s^1\neq 0\}})_{s\leq T}$ in $\mathcal{H}_T^2(\mathbf{R})$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad \forall s \leq T, \quad Y_s^2 = g_2(X_T^{0,x_0}) + \int_s^T H_2^*(r, X_r^{0,x_0}, Z_r^1, Z_r^2, \theta_r)dr - \int_s^T Z_r^2 dB_r.$$

The proof is completed. □

3. Generalizations. In this Section, we are going to deal with some generalizations of Theorem 2.6 in the following three aspects:

(i) For the drift term Γ in SDE (2.4) which reads,

$$\Gamma(t, x, u, v) = f(t, x) + u + v, \ u \in [0, 1] \text{ and } v \in [-1, 1],$$

one can replace:

(a) $[0, 1]$ and $[-1, 1]$ with arbitrary closed bounded intervals ;

(b) u (resp. v) of Γ with $h(u)$ (resp. $\ell(v)$) where h and ℓ are continuous functions defined on $U = [a, b]$ and $V = [c, d]$ respectively. In this case $U' = h(U)$ and $V' = \ell(V)$ are also bounded closed intervals. The Nash equilibrium point $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ exists and is still of bang-bang type. The unique difference is that, it will jump between the bound of set U' (resp. V') instead of U (resp. V). □

(ii) As we indicated in Remark 2.1, the dynamics of the process $X^{t,x}$ of (2.1) may contain a diffusion term $\sigma(t, x)$ (see equation (3.1)) which is a function defined as:

$$(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbf{R} \mapsto \sigma(t, x) \in \mathbf{R},$$

with the following assumption:

Assumption (A1): The function $\sigma(t,x)$ is uniformly Lipschitz w.r.t. x, it is invertible and bounded and its inverse is bounded.

Under (A1), for any $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}$, the following SDE

$$X_s^{t,x} = x + \int_t^s \sigma(r, X_r^{t,x}) dB_r, \ \forall s \in [t,T] \text{ and } X_s^{t,x} = x \text{ for } s \in [0,t], \tag{3.1}$$

has a unique solution (see e.g. Karatzas and Shreve, pp.289, [25]). Moreover σ satisfies the uniform elliptic condition, *i.e.* there exists a constant $\Upsilon > 0$ such that for any $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}$, $\Upsilon \leq \sigma(t,x)^2 \leq \Upsilon^{-1}$.

In this framework, the Hamiltonian functions associated with the NZSDG of payoffs given by (2.5) are defined from $[0,T] \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \times U \times V$ into $\mathbf{R}$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(t,x,p,u,v) &:= p\sigma^{-1}(t,x)\Gamma(t,x,u,v) = p\sigma^{-1}(t,x)(f(t,x)+u+v); \\ H_2(t,x,q,u,v) &:= q\sigma^{-1}(t,x)\Gamma(t,x,u,v) = q\sigma^{-1}(t,x)(f(t,x)+u+v). \end{aligned}$$

Noticing that σ^{-1} is bounded, it follows by the generalized Isaacs' condition (2.8) and the same approach in this article that, the Nash equilibrium point exists and is of bang-bang type.

Actually we should point out that, all the results in this article will hold by the same techniques in this case (ii) with only some minor adaptions, except the convergence to 0 of the second term on the right side of inequality (2.32) which needs to be checked carefully. Indeed the objective is to show that

$$|\mathbf{E}[\int_{t+\delta}^T (H_i^n(s, X_s^{t,x}) - H_i^m(s, X_s^{t,x})) \cdot 1_{\{|X_s^{t,x}| \leq k\}} ds]| \to_{n,m\to\infty} 0. \tag{3.2}$$

for fixed (t,x) and k. To begin with we give the following result related to domination of laws of the process $X^{t,x}$.

LEMMA 3.1. **(L^q-Domination)** *Let $t \in [0,T]$ and $x, x_0 \in \boldsymbol{R}$. For $s \in [t,T]$, we denote by $\mu(t,x;s,dy)$ the law of $X_s^{t,x}$. Under Assumption (A1) on σ, for any $\bar{q} \in (1,\infty)$, the family of laws $\{\mu(t,x;s,dy),\ s \in (t,T]\}$ is $L^{\bar{q}}$-dominated by $\{\mu(0,x_0;s,dy),\ s \in (t,T]\}$, i.e., for any $\delta \in (0,T-t)$, there exists an application $\phi^\delta_{t,x,x_0} : [t+\delta,T] \times \boldsymbol{R} \to \boldsymbol{R}^+$ such that:*

(a) $\mu(t,x;s,dy)ds = \phi^\delta_{t,x,x_0}(s,y)\mu(0,x_0;s,dy)ds$ for any $(s,y) \in [t+\delta,T] \times \boldsymbol{R}$;

(b) $\forall k \geq 1,\ \phi^\delta_{t,x,x_0}(s,y) \in L^{\bar{q}}([t+\delta,T] \times [-k,k];\ \mu(0,x_0;s,dy)ds)$.

Proof. Readers are referred to [20] (Section 28, pp.123) and [23] (Lemma 4.3 and Corollary 4.4, pp.14-15) for the proof of this Lemma. However basically it uses the Aronson estimates [1] for densities of the laws of the solution of SDE (3.1) under Assumption (A1).

Proof of convergence (3.2)**:** Thanks to Lemma 3.1, there exists a function $\phi^\delta_{t,x,x_0} : [t+\delta,T] \times \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}^+$ such that:

$$\forall k \geq 1,\ \phi^\delta_{t,x,x_0}(s,y) \in L^{\frac{q}{q-1}}([t+\delta,T] \times [-k,k];\ \mu(0,x_0;s,dy)ds). \tag{3.3}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbf{E}[\int_{t+\delta}^T (H_i^n(s, X_s^{t,x}) - H_i^m(s, X_s^{t,x})) \cdot 1_{\{|X_s^{t,x}| \leq k\}} ds]| \\ &\quad = |\int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{t+\delta}^T (H_i^n(s,y) - H_i^m(s,y)) \cdot 1_{\{|y| \leq k\}} \mu(t,x;s,dy)ds| \\ &\quad = |\int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{t+\delta}^T (H_i^n(s,y) - H_i^m(s,y)) \cdot 1_{\{|y| \leq k\}} \phi^\delta_{t,x,x_0}(s,y)\mu(0,x_0;s,dy)ds|. \end{aligned}$$

The constant q in (3.3) is the one which makes that $H_i^n(s,y) \to_{n\to\infty} H_i(s,y)$ weakly in $L^q([0,T]\times\mathbf{R};\ \mu(0,x_0;s,dy)ds)$ for $i=1,2$ and a fixed $q\in(1,2)$. Then combining this weak convergence result and (3.3) yields (3.2). □

(iii) In the same way one can deal with the multi-dimensional case for diffusion processes $X^{t,x}$ satisfying (3.1) when $\sigma(t,x)$ verifies Assumption (A1). □

REFERENCES

[1] D.G. Aronson, *Bounds for the fundamental solution of a parabolic equation*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical society, 73.6, 1967, pp. 890-896.

[2] A. V. Balakrishnan, *On stochastic bang-bang control*, Appl Math Optim 6 : 91-96, 1980.

[3] V.E. Benes, *Girsanov functionals and optimal bang-bang laws for final value stochastic control*, Stochastic Proc Appl 2 : 127-140 6, 1974.

[4] A. Bensoussan and J. Frehse, *Stochastic games for N players*. J. Optim. Theory Appl., 105, 2000, pp. 543-565.

[5] A. Bensoussan and J. Frehse, *Nonlinear elliptic systems in stochastic game theory*. J. Reine Angew. Math., 350, 1984, pp. 23-67.

[6] Ph. Briand, B. Delyon, Y. Hu, E. Pardoux, L. Stoica, *L_p solutions of backward stochastic differential equations*, Stochastic Processes and Their Applications. 108.1, 2003, pp. 109-129.

[7] R. Buckdahn and J. Li, *Stochastic differential games and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equations*. SIAM J. Control Optim. 47, 2008, no. 1, pp.444-475.

[8] W. H. Fleming and P. E. Souganidis, *On the existence of value functions of two- player, zero-sum stochastic differential games*. Indiana Univ. Math. J., 38, 1989, pp. 293-314.

[9] R. Isaacs, *Differential Games*. Wiley, New York, 1965.

[10] R. Buckdahn, P. Cardaliaguet and C. Rainer, *Nash equilibrium payoffs for nonzero-sum stochastic differential games*, SIAM journal on control and optimization, 43.2, 2004, pp. 624-642.

[11] R. Carmona, F. Delarue, *Probabilistic analysis of mean-field games*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 51.4, 2013, pp. 2705-2734.

[12] R. Carmona, F. Delarue and A. Lachapelle, *Control of McKean Vlasov dynamics versus mean field games*, Mathematics and Financial Economics, 7.2, 2013, pp. 131-166.

[13] N. Christopeit and K.Helmes, *On Benes' bang-bang control problem*. Appl. Math. Optim. 9, no. 2, 1982/83, pp. 163-176.

[14] N. El-Karoui and S. Hamadène, *BSDEs and risk-sensitive control, zero-sum and nonzero-sum game problems of stochastic functional differential equations*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 107.1, 2003, pp.145-169.

[15] N. El-Karoui, S. Peng and M.C. Quenez, *Backward stochastic differential equations in finance*, Mathematical finance, 7.1, 1997, pp. 1-71.

[16] A. Friedman, *Stochastic differential games*, J. Differential Equations, 11.1, 1972, pp. 79-108.

[17] I.V. Girsanov, *On transforming a certain class of stochastic processes by absolutely continuous substitution of measures*, Theory of Probability and its Applications, 5.3, 1960, pp. 285-301.

[18] S. Hamadène, J.-P.Lepeltier, *Backward equations, stochastic control and zero-sum stochastic differential games*, Stochastics Stochastics Rep. 54, 1995, no. 3-4, 221-231.

[19] S. Hamadène and J.-P.Lepeltier, *Zero-sum stochastic differential games and backward equations*. Systems Control Lett. 24, 1995, no. 4, 259-263.

[20] S. Hamadène, J.-P. Lepeltier and S. Peng, *BSDEs with continuous coefficients and stochastic differential games*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, 1997, pp. 115-128.

[21] S. Hamadène, *Nonzero sum linear-quadratic stochastic differential games and backward-forward equations*, Stochastic Analysis and Applications, 17.1, 1999, pp. 117-130.

[22] S. Hamadène, *Backward-forward SDEs and stochastic differential games*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 77.1, 1998, pp. 1-15.

[23] S. Hamadène and R. Mu, *Existence of Nash equilibrium points for markovian nonzero-sum stochastic differential games with unbounded coefficients*, Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes, 87.1, 2014, pp. 85-111.

[24] U.G. Haussmann, *A stochastic maximum principle for optimal control of diffusions*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1986.

[25] I. Karatzas and S.E. Shreve, *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus - 2nd ed.*, Springer Verlag, 1991.

[26] Q. Lin, *A BSDE approach to Nash equilibrium payoffs for stochastic differential games with nonlinear cost functionals*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 122.1, 2012, pp. 357-385.
[27] P. Mannucci, *Nonzero-sum stochastic differential games with discontinuous feedback*, SIAM journal on control and optimization, 43.4, 2004, pp. 1222-1233.
[28] H.Maurer and N.P. Osmolovskii, *Second Order Sufficient Conditions for Time-Optimal Bang-Bang Control*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 42.6, pp. 2239-2263.
[29] E. Pardoux and S. Peng, *Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation*, Systems & Control Letters, 14.1, 1990, pp. 55-61.
[30] P. Protter, *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations, 2nd ed.*, Springer-Verlag, 2004.
[31] C. Rainer, *Two different approaches to nonzero-sum stochastic differential games*, Applied Mathematics and Optimization, 56.1, 2007, pp. 131-144.
[32] D.Revuz and M.Yor, *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, Third Edition, Springer 1999.